Exhibit 8

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION		
3	NETLIST, INC., (CAUSE NO. 2:21-CV-463-JRG		
4	Plaintiff, (
5	vs. (
6 7	SAMSUNG ELECTRONICS CO., LTD., (et al.,) MARSHALL, TEXAS (APRIL 18, 2023		
8	Defendants.) 8:30 A.M.		
9			
10			
11	VOLUME 3		
12			
13	TRIAL ON THE MERITS		
14	BEFORE THE HONORABLE RODNEY GILSTRAP		
15	UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE and a jury		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22	SHAWN MCROBERTS, RMR, CRR 100 E. HOUSTON STREET		
23	MARSHALL, TEXAS 75670 (903) 923-8546		
24	shawn_mcroberts@txed.uscourts.gov		
25			

1	<u>APPEARA</u>	N C E S
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: IR	ELL & MANELLA, LLP - S ANGELES
3	18	00 AVENUE OF THE STARS
4	LC	S ANGELES, CA 90067-4276
5	`	: MR. JASON SHEASBY MS. LISA GLASSER
6		MR. BEN MANZIN-MONNIN
7		KOOL SMITH, P.C MARSHALL 4 E. HOUSTON ST., SUITE 300
8	MA	RSHALL, TEXAS 75670
9	BY	: MR. SAM BAXTER MS. JENNIFER TRUELOVE
10		MR. KEVIN BURGESS
11	FOR THE DEFENDANTS: FI	SH & RICHARDSON, PC - SHINGTON DC
12		00 MAINE AVE. SW, SUITE 1000 SHINGTON, D.C. 20024
13	·	02) 783-5070 : MR. RUFFIN CORDELL
14		MR. MICHAEL MCKEON
15		LLAM & SMITH, LLP 3 SOUTH WASHINGTON AVENUE
16		RSHALL, TEXAS 75670 03) 934-8450
17	BY	: MS. MELISSA SMITH
18		AWN M. McROBERTS, RMR, CRR 0 E. HOUSTON STREET
19		RSHALL, TEXAS 75670 03) 923-8546
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

INDEX

EXAMINATION

Witness Name	Page
MICHAEL BROGIOLI, PH.D.	
Cross By MR. CORDELL	
Redirect By MR. BURGESS	613
Recross By MR. CORDELL	625
INDONG KIM	
BY DEPOSITION	634
JIHWAN KIM	
BY DEPOSITION	638
HYUN-JOONG KIM	
BY DEPOSITION	643
BRUCE LO	
BY DEPOSITION	647
GARRETT DAVEY	
BY DEPOSITION	651
HUN-JOO LEE	
BY DEPOSITION	655
SUNG JOO PARK	
BY DEPOSITION	662
ANSON TSUI	
BY DEPOSITION	664
DAVID KENNEDY	
Direct By MS. GLASSER	668
Cross By MR. CORDELL	705
Redirect By MS. GLASSER	765
JOSEPH CALANDRA	
Direct By MS. SMITH	786
Cross By MS. GLASSER	815
HYUN KEN LEE	
BY DEPOSITION	843
MARIO JESUS MARTINEZ	
BY DEPOSITION	851
HYUN JOONG "JOHNNY" KIM	
BY DEPOSITION	854

1	THE COURT: Be seated, please.
2	Are the parties prepared to read into the record those
3	items from the list of pre-admitted exhibits used during yet
4	yesterday's portion of the trial?
5	MS. TRUELOVE: We are, Your Honor.
6	THE COURT: Please proceed.
7	MS. TRUELOVE: The exhibits that Plaintiff Netlist
8	used yesterday during trial are the following JTX exhibits:
9	007, 008, 009, 0011, 0012, 0013, 0014, 0015, 0016, 0026, 0028,
10	0031, 0037, 0038, 0046, 0060, 0061, 0063, 0065, 0066, 0067,
11	0068, and 0020.
12	We also used PX 932 and PX 636.
13	THE COURT: All right. Is there any objection from
14	Defendants as to that rendition from Plaintiff?
15	MS. SMITH: No objection from Samsung, Your Honor.
16	THE COURT: Does Samsung have additional items from
17	the list of pre-admitted exhibits to read into the record?
18	MS. SMITH: We do, Your Honor. Yesterday Samsung
19	used DTX 28, JTX 30, JTX 54, JTX 56, and JTX 62.
20	THE COURT: All right. Any objection from Netlist?
21	MS. TRUELOVE: No objection, Your Honor.
22	THE COURT: All right. Thank you, counsel.
23	Doctor Brogioli, are you with us? If you'll return to
24	the witness stand, please, sir. I remind you, you remain
25	under oath.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

2.1

2.2

23

less, more than likely somebody's just going to go somewhere else.

So this is important for Samsung to retain its market position in this product is to use the technology and not try to sell a slower product.

- Q. So let's turn to the second category of products, those DDR4 patents with respect to the '339 Patent. Can you walk us through what are the key considerations there?
- A. Sure. Again, the hypothetical negotiation, both parties have access to this financial information, and they would know that Samsung has sold \$312.1 million worth of DDR4 infringing products just during the damages period.

And they would also know, as we heard from Doctor

Mangione, that without Netlist technology, the product sold

wouldn't be usable in this two DIMMs per channel configuration

and that the next best alternative would be to try to sell a

bigger DPC LRDIMM at a lower price.

- Q. Did you calculate out how much of a price difference there would be if Samsung had to present its customers with this alternative of the only allowing one per channel rather than presenting them as they do now with the accused product?

 A. I did. So I looked at the two DIMM per channel products prices and compared that to without Netlist technology, a one
- DIMM per channel but with a larger capacity, a bigger chip, and that was more expensive.

```
THE COURT: All right. Let me see Mr. Cordell,
 1
     Mr. McKeon, and Ms. Smith, together with Mr. Sheasby,
 2
     Mr. Burgess, and Ms. Truelove in chambers.
 3
 4
          Otherwise, we stand in recess until tomorrow morning.
                (The proceedings were concluded at 5:30 p.m.)
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```